

Serial No. 10/604,049
Filed: June 24, 2003
Page 6 of 7

Examiner: S. Huang
Group Art Unit: 2632

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were in the application as examined. By the present amendment, claims 1 and 16 are amended and claims 2 and 19 are canceled without prejudice. No new matter is added by the amendments, full support therefore being found in the specification. Claims 1, 3-18, and 20-22 remain in the application for further examination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. It is noted that the same claims have been patented in the U.K. over the same reference relied upon by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 - 10 and 12 - 22 stand rejected as being anticipated by Maple et al. (GB2353425A). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The system disclosed in the Maple et al. patent depends upon a geographical locating system such as the Global Positioning System (GPS). Moreover, the system of the Maple et al. patent, while teaching that key *may* be used, does not necessarily *require* the use of an appropriate key.

By contrast, the invention of claims 1 and 16, as amended, is not tied to a location verifying means such as the GPS, nor is it operable by a person without an appropriate key. Nothing in the Maple et al. patent reaches the limitation in claims 1 and 16 of a security switch operable *solely* by means of an authorized user having the appropriate key *and* independently of a geographical location system. Thus, there is no anticipation of claims 1 and 16 by Maple et al.

Regarding the Examiner's comments on claim 2 (the subject matter of which is now in claim 1), the Maple et al. patent teaches that the first input device *may* be key-operated. But nothing in Maple et al. teaches or suggests that the first input device is operated *solely* by means of an authorized user having the appropriate key.

Claims 3 to 10 and claims 12 to 15 are all dependent either directly or indirectly on claim 1. Further, claims 17 to 22 are all dependent directly or indirectly on claim 16. Since claims 1 and 16 as amended are not anticipated by Maple et al., these claims are likewise not anticipated for the same reasons as claims 1 and 16.

Serial No. 10/604,049
Filed: June 24, 2003
Page 7 of 7

Examiner: S. Huang
Group Art Unit: 2632

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 11 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Maple et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 depends indirectly on claim 1 and is therefore patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable. The Maple et al. patent teaches a system that is dependant upon a geographical locating means. The invention of claim 11 is specifically *independent* of a geographical locating system. Consequently, the Maple et al. patent teaches away from the concept claimed in claim 1. Claim 11 also requires a key, a concept that is permissive but not required in the Maple et al. patent. Therefore claim 11 is not unpatentable in view of the Maple et al. patent.

Conclusion


Having regard to all of the foregoing, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider the objections in the light of the amended claims and notice of allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

ALAN JAMES MAPLE AND IAN MARTIN LENNARD

Dated: 5 December 2005

By: _____


Joel E. Bair, Reg. No. 33,356
MCGARRY BAIR P.C.
171 Monroe Avenue, NW, Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500

G0199697.DOC